UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/626,218 | 07/22/2003 | Lars Tommy Westbye | 706737.4003 | 9652 | |
| | 7590 07/24/2008 RICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP | | | EXAMINER | |
| IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT | | | WITCZAK, CATHERINE | | |
| 4 PARK PLAZA SUITE 1600 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| IRVINE, CA 92614-2558 | | | 3767 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 07/24/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Commence | 10/626,218 | WESTBYE ET AL. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | CATHERINE N. WITCZAK | 3767 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 M | av 2008 | | | | | | |
| · <u> </u> | action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | • | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | laction requirement | | | | | | |
| o) Claim(s) 1-40 are subject to restriction and/or e | riection requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some coll None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | te | | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-24 drawn to a medical injection system comprising a cartridge housing, shield,

drive system, and activation system, classified in class 604, subclass 192.

II. Claims 25-32, drawn to a medical injection system comprising a needle guard

removeable from the system, classified in class 604, subclass 187.

III. Claim 33, drawn to a needle guard, classified in class 604, subclass 110.

IV. Claim 34, drawn to an automatic injection system, classified in class 604, subclass 134.

V. Claims 35-48, drawn to a method of injection a dose, classified in class 604, subclass

500.

Inventions I, II, III, IV and V are directed to related products/methods. The related inventions are

distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially

different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are

mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In

the instant case, the inventions as claimed have materially different design. Furthermore, the inventions

as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be

obvious variants.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in

this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and

examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

(a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;

(b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

- (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/626,218 Page 4

Art Unit: 3767

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the

inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named

inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of

inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37

CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to CATHERINE N. WITCZAK whose telephone number is (571)272-7179. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin

Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this

application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer

Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR

CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Catherine N Witczak/

Examiner, Art Unit 3767

/Kevin C. Sirmons/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767